

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/712,053	11/14/2003	William N. Borkan	829/36582D	9020
7590 08/15/2006			EXAMINER	
BARNES & THORNBURG			GEDEON, BRIAN T	
Suite 900 750 17th Street, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20006			3766	
			DATE MAILED: 08/15/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/712,053	BORKAN, WILLIAM N.			
Office Action Sum	mary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Brian T. Gedeon	3766			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FRC - Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing dat- If NO period for reply is specified above, the - Failure to reply within the set or extended p	M THE MAILING DATHE provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 of this communication. It maximum statutory period will period for reply will, by statute, corree months after the mailing d	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
 Responsive to communica This action is FINAL. Since this application is in closed in accordance with 	2b)∏ This a condition for allowand	action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) _ 5) ☐ Claim(s) <u>7-13</u> is/are allowed 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-6,14-17 and 19</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>18</u> is/are objected 8) ☐ Claim(s) _ are subjected 6.	is/are withdrawid. d. - <u>24</u> is/are rejected. I to.					
Application Papers						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are: a) accept any objection to the dress; including the correction	oted or b) objected to by the larawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/712,053 Page 2

Art Unit: 3766

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 24 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. New claim 24 depends on claim 7, and is a duplicate of claim 11, also depending from claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaiani et al. (US Patent no. 5,374,285) in view of Quinn et al. (US Patent no. 6,036,654).

In regard to claims 1, 5, 19 and 22, Vaiani et al. discloses an electrode catheter for inserting near the spinal column (i.e., intrathecal space), col 3 lines 13-20. The catheter comprises a tubular sheath 1 with an electrode P, col 3 lines 21-30. The sheath has an open central passage, which has a diameter large enough to allow a fixation stylet through, col 3 lines 53-58. Quinn et al. discloses a multi-lumen, multi-parameter catheter that is capable of pacing the heart (i.e., delivering electrical therapy)

and drug infusion, col 1 lines 14-19 and 43-51. The catheter 10 comprises a flexible catheter tube 12 that inherently comprises a proximal end and a distal end. The distal end of the catheter 10 has an inflatable balloon 32 allowing for ease of implantation as well as anchoring. The catheter has a plurality of lumens, col 3 lines 29-35, of which one is a fiber optic lumen 24 to house optic fibers, col 4 lines 21-24. The Examiner contends that the lumen is an open passage and inherently comprises an inlet and an outlet. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Vaiani et al. with Quinn et al. design a multi-lumen stimulation catheter for undertaking therapeutic operations such as drug infusion or using fiber optics photonic light therapy.

In regard to claim 2, Vaiani et al. describes the claimed invention except for anchor at the distal end. Quinn et al. describes the distal end of the catheter 10 with an inflatable balloon 32. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to anchor the distal end of a catheter with an inflatable balloon since it was well known the art at the time.

In regard to claims 3, 6, 20, and 23, Vaiani et al. discloses a catheter with holes 15 at the distal end 1a so as to permit the infusion of drugs into the region.

3. Claims 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaiani et al. (US Patent no. 5,374,285) in view of Deletis et al. (US Patent no. 5,081,990), further in view of King (US Patent no. 4,630,611).

In regard to claims 14, 15, 17, and 24, Vaiani et al. discloses an electrode catheter for inserting near the spinal column (i.e., intrathecal space), col 3 lines 13-20.

Art Unit: 3766

The catheter comprises a tubular sheath 1 with an electrode P, col 3 lines 21-30. The sheath has an open central passage, which has a diameter large enough to allow a fixation stylet through, col 3 lines 53-58. Vaiani et al. is also equipped with holes 15 for administering therapeutic drugs. Deletis et al. presents a catheter for spinal epidural injection of drugs and measurement of evoked potentials. The catheter inherently possesses a distal end and a proximal end, as depicted in figure 1. The distal end has a plurality of electrodes 12, 13, and 14, which lie along. Passage 31 is adapted to be fitted with a stylet to aid in directing the device for optimal placement, col 3 lines 43-45. The catheter includes another passage 32 located at the proximal end and leads to one or more outlets 11, col 3 lines 49-53, for dispensing medication. Relocation of outlets 11 along the catheter, to the distal end, would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since it has been held that rearranging parts of the involves only routine skill in the art, In re Japiske, 86 USPQ 70. King shows a body implantable lead 30, with electrode pairs 34 and 36 near the distal. Figure 2 shows these electrode pairs separated by in degrees around the curvature of the lead. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to embody a catheter in this manner so provide electrical and pharmacological therapy to a desired area of the spinal cord.

Further, in regard to claims 14, 15, and 17, the claimed method would be obvious in view structure set out by the structure recited by the above combine references.

In regard to claim 24, Vaiani et al. in view of Deletis et al. substantially describe the invention as claimed, except for the degree of extension around the surface of the Art Unit: 3766

lead body. Figure 2 of King shows electrodes 34 and 36 on the distal end of lead body 30. Here the electrodes 34 and 36 are separated by 180 degrees. However the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to adjust spacing between electrodes to achieve different degrees of separation, and it would have been obvious as well to increase the surface size of the electrode to increase the degree of extension about the lead body and thereby decreasing the amount of separation in degrees between the electrodes.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7-13 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art disclosed fails to teach alone, or in combination, the use of a extension wire with an additional electrode emanating from the tip of the distal end of the catheter. Therefore the Examiner deems independent claim 7 and its depending claims allowable over the prior record.

Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Application/Control Number: 10/712,053 Page 6

Art Unit: 3766

Conclusion

5. The new grounds of rejection necessitated by the amendment effectively make this action **FINAL**.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Konings (US Patent no. 6,236,879) and Tjin (US Patent no. 6,166,806) both disclose fiber optic catheters. Mackey (US Patent no. 5,423,877) shows electrodes mounted on the distal end of an implantable lead, and extending several degrees about the exterior of the lead surface. Gelinas et al. (US Patent no. 4,522,212) shows an endocardial electrode with wire springs on the distal end.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. Gedeon whose telephone number is (571) 272 3447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272 6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/712,053

Art Unit: 3766

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian T. Gedeon Patent Examiner Art Unit 3766 Robert E. Pozzuto
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3766

Page 7

BTG